

REMARKS***Objection and Amendments to the Specification***

The Examiner objected to the specification with respect to recitation of embedded hyperlink code. See *Office Action*, 3-4. With the exception of the link appearing on page 122, the objected to links have been previously removed from the specification in *Amendment C*. The offending code at page 122 has been removed through the present amendment.

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 Rejection

The Examiner contends that the 'information source / access evaluator' limitation of claim 1 lacks proper written description under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1—prior to *Amendment D*—recited a limitation that read as follows:

providing the information as a value of the field indicated by the field name in the selected row, in response to the query , and wherein the information source comprises an access evaluator, the access evaluator configured to determine whether a user may have access to an information resource within the information source.

As noted by the Applicants in *Amendment D*, the aforementioned 'access evaluator' element was cancelled and 'relocated' in the context of the present 'information source' limitation. This relocation of claim language did not change the scope of the claim (especially with respect to the written description requirement) but did improve its clarity. The 'access evaluator' claim element was not previously under rejection with respect to lack of written description and thus the Applicants traverse the Examiner's contention that said limitation now lacks the same.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner contends that Dalal discloses an information source including "an access evaluator configured to determine whether a user may have access to an information resource within the information source." In support of this rejection, the Examiner cited to lines 40-60 of Dalal at column 8. See *Office Action*, 5. Dalal, as cited by the Examiner, evidences no such teaching. Dalal concerns a user inputting a text string representing a query. See *Dalal*, col. 8, l. 41. Dalal then describes utilizing Open Database Connectivity (ODBC) for string connection building; Dalal also provides a series of connect string examples. See *Dalal*, col. 8, l. 42-59 (concerning ODBC); col. 8, l. 50-60 (concerning string connection examples). At no point does Dalal disclose the presently claimed access evaluator. Dalal discloses "[a] method for accessing a database server using pass-through queries includes parsing a database query to separate a pass-through string, and then sending a pass-through string to retrieve information regarding the structure of a remote table." *Dalal*, Abstract. No access evaluation is disclosed. FIGURE 4 as referenced by the Examiner also lacks any teaching of an access evaluator as is presently claimed. See *Office Action*, 5.

The Examiner admits that the Noble reference fails to disclose the aforementioned access evaluator. See *Office Action*, 4-5. The Applicants have, through the present response, evidenced the failure to Dalal to disclose the same. A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that the prior art references teach or suggest all of the claim limitation. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). As Noble and Dalal—either individually or in combination with one another—fail to teach the aforementioned access evaluator, the present 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection is overcome.

Dependent Claims

Each and every one of the dependent claims of the present application depends either directly from—or via another dependent claim that ultimately depends from—claim 1 of the present application. As a dependent claim incorporates each and every limitation of the claim from which it depends under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4 and the Applicants contend claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons as set forth above, the Applicants contend each and every one of the dependent claims of the present application are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Information Disclosure Statement

A new *Information Disclosure Statement* is submitted herewith. Favorable consideration of the present claims in light of these newly identified references is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants have amended the specification to overcome the Examiner's rejection with respect to recitation of executable code.

The Applicants have traversed the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 rejection with respect to an 'access evaluator.' The Applicants noted that the rejected claim element was previously recited in another part of the claim body. The Examiner offered no written description rejection as to that same element in the previous context. The Applicants contend that the present context does not change the interpretation of the claim recitation and, therefore, the written description rejection of that claim element should be withdrawn.

The Applicants have evidenced the non-obviousness of independent claim 1 of the present application versus the combination of *Noble et al.* and *Dalal et al.* Specifically, the Applicants have noted the lack of the presently claimed access evaluator. As each and every element is not found in the Examiner's proposed combination, the Applicants believe the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to have been overcome.

The Applicants also request consideration of the concurrently submitted *Information Disclosure Statement*.

As all of the Examiner's rejections are overcome, the Applicants respectfully request the passage of the present application to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions concerning this amendment or the overall state of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Clifford Harnel et al.

July 5, 2007

By:

Kenneth M. Kaslow

Kenneth M. Kaslow (Reg. No. 32,246)
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: 650.812.3400
Fax: 650.812.3444